DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 188 CS 208 891

AUTHOR Moss, R. Kay
TITLE Transactions among Teachers and Children: Teachers' Instruction and the Writing Processes of Kindergarten Children.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Communication; Classroom Environment; Interpersonal Communication; *Kindergarten Children; Primary Education; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Student Relationship; *Writing Instruction; *Writing Processes; *Writing Research

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to document the written language of kindergarten children as a transaction among writers, teachers, and the writing process. Six children's writing processes and two teachers' instructional behaviors were examined using videotaped observations during an eight month period in two kindergarten classrooms. Writing products of the entire classroom were collected. Interviews with the child writers and the teachers were conducted to monitor participant perceptions regarding both teacher instruction and children's writing behaviors. Teachers' instructional decisions were found to be the most important influences on children's writing processes in the classroom. Children in the natural language-learning classroom tended to be more message-centered and self-reliant than did children in a standardized, sequential writing classroom. The results indicated that children, when given the opportunity to take risks with written language, create with semantic intent. (Author/DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258188

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Transactions among Teachers and Children:

Teachers' Instruction

and the Writing Processes of Kindergarten Children

R. Kay Moss

Department of Educational

Curriculum and Instruction

Bowling Green State University

Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Ph. (419) 372-0151

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Kay Moss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running Head: TRANSACTIONS

CS 208 871

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to document written language of kindergarten children as a transaction among writers, teachers, and the writing process.

Using videotaped observations during an eight month period in two kindergarten classrooms, six children's writing processes and the two teachers' instructional behaviors were described. Writing products of the entire classroom were collected. Interviews with the child-writers and the teachers were conducted to monitor participant perceptions regarding both teacher instruction and the writing behaviors of children.

Teachers' instructional decisions were the most important influence on the writing processes used in the classroom. Children in the natural language-learning classroom tended to be more message-centered and self-reliant than did children in a standardized, sequential writing classroom.

The study indicated that children, when given the opportunity to take risks with written language, create with semantic intent.

Transactions among Teachers and Children:
Teachers' Instruction
and the Writing Processes of Kindergarten Children

The purpose of this study was to document written language learning of kindergarten children as a transaction among writers, teachers, and the writing process. The study describes 1) the instructional decisions of teachers as the most important influence on the writing processes used in the classroom and 2) young writers as having semantic intent when in a context that encourages that intent.

Prior to the 1970's, research on writing and the teaching of writing was a rather neglected aspect of educational inquiry. Many earlier studies either examined teacher behavior to determine the "best method" for teaching writing (Petersen, 1980; O'Hare, 1979; Glassner, 1979) or analyzed writing products (Beers, 1976; Henderson, 1978; Beers & Henderson, 1977; Clay, 1975). Although there were attempts to infer from the written products the thinking process during writing (Kinneavy, 1971; Odell, 1977), and to develop theories of writing (Page, 1974; Ney, 1974; King & Rentel, 1979; Shanklin, 1981), researchers have only recently begun to study the instructional behaviors of the teacher (Carter, 1983) and the writing process of children (Graves, 1981b; Harste, Burke & Woodward, 1983).

Teachers' Instructional Behaviors

Teachers' behaviors in the teaching of writing differ vastly. While some instructional approaches are determined by the grade level of the child or the curricular materials selected for use in the language arts classroom (Graves, 1977), other instructional approaches are determined by the writing processes of the individual child (Graves & Giacobbe, 1982; Kamler, 1980). These two approaches to writing instruction are briefly described here.

The first set of instructional approaches, referred to here as standardized, sequential writing instruction, is strongly influenced by the textbook and other curricular materials selected by the elementary school (Graves, 1977). Curricular materials in writing are determined by grade level, with specific writing skills designated to be taught at a particular grade level. Thus, skills are standardized across and within grade levels and sequenced throughout the curriculum. This prestructured textbook approach to writing instruction advocates instruction at the point of topic suggestion (Graves, 1981b), stresses writing more than prewriting (Harrington-Brogan, 1983), and neglects postwriting almost entirely (Harrington-Brogan, 1983). Language Arts textbook activities upon which much instruction is based, seem to include few suggestions consistent with authoritative opinion (Harrington-Brogan, 1983), thus ignoring the possible benefits of instruction during the writing process (Graves, 1981a).

In contrast to the standardized, sequential writing instruction approach, other researchers (Graves & Giacobbe, 1982; Kamler, 1980) described a different approach to writing instruction, which advocates teacher involvement during the prewriting, composing, and postwriting phases. This approach, referred to as natural language-learning, advocates teacher recognition of key aspects of the writing process, such as the children's increased awareness of audience, increased control of the revision process (Graves and Giacobbe, 1982; Kamler, 1980), and increased control of conventions such as punctuation (Cordeiro, Giocobbe, & Cazden, 1983).

Writing Process Research

The past decade marked the beginning of a new line of naturalistic research (Guba & Lincoln, 1981) which focused on the process of writing. The dissertation by Graves (1973) marked one of the first such investigations of children's writing. Instead of focusing on written products, this research documented

children's behaviors and decisions while in the actual process of writing. More recent studies described the writing process of elementary children (Graves, 1979a; Graves 1979b; Graves & Calkins, 1980; Dyson, 1983; Lamme & Childers, 1983), as well as children's writing development (Graves, 1979a; Graves, 1982; Cordeiro, Giacobbe, & Cazden, 1983).

Other researchers have shown that there is evidence that writing is closely connected to the theoretical orientation of the teacher (DeFord, 1978, 1981), to the context of the situation (King, 1981; Moss & Stansell, 1982; Moss & Stansell, 1983; Lamme & Childers, 1983), and to children's background experiences (Harste, Burke, and Woodward, 1983; Raban, 1982).

This study has examined the teachers' instructional behaviors and the writing of children during several writing episodes. By viewing writing and instructional processes in relation to each other, this research has documented the written language learning of young children as a transaction among the writers, the teachers, and the process.

A number of questions were posed for exploration within four interlocking phases of the research design. Phase 1 of the study involved questions of the writing products of all children (N=30) in the study (Are theme choice, frequency, and length of children's products influenced by the teachers' instructional behaviors?). Phase 2 examined the teachers' (N=3) instructional behaviors such as time spent on writing; prewriting, composing, postwriting instructional behaviors; and teacher-evaluation of children's writing. Phase 3 of the study documented children's writing processes during the phases of writing and in light of their experiences with writing and the teachers' instructional behaviors. Phase 4 was concerned with children's perceptions of their own writing process and the instructional behaviors of their teachers.

METHODS

Design of the Study

Data were collected and analyzed in four general phases: large group (N=30), teacher instruction (N=2), writing process (N=6), and interview (N=2). Data from these four phases were gathered throughout each writing episode of this investigation.

Data were gathered through the following procedures: teacher collection of the writing products of children within two kindergarten classrooms; observation, through video and handwritten recordings, of two kindergarten teachers' instructional behaviors during each phase of the composing episodes of the children; observation, through video and handwritten recordings, of children during writing episodes and interactions between the teachers and children during the writing episodes; and interviews with children concerning their writing processes and the teachers' instructional behaviors during writing instruction.

Selection of Participants

Approximately 30 teachers were initially observed; from these observations, two teachers in two private kindergarten classes in an East Central Texas community were selected because the teachers' writing instructional behaviors reflected differing approaches to the teaching of writing. These different approaches will be referred to as standardized, sequential writing instruction (Mrs. H), and a natural language-learning approach to classroom writing (Mrs. M).

The site chosen for the study was a community whose citizens reflect a wide range of socio-economic backgrounds from the rural poor to the faculty members of the local state university. Although not considered a relevant factor in language learning (Harste, Burke, & Woodward, 1981), the socio-economic and racial mixture of the children in the private kindergartens of

this study did not reflect the population of the community: none of the children enrolled in either of the private schools were Black, and there were only a few children of non-white backgrounds.

Selection of Classrooms. The two kindergarten teachers were selected on the basis of 1) providing children with at least some writing experiences; and 2) providing a contrast in instructional behaviors as defined in this study. These teachers were not trained in any instructional methods whatsoever, nor were they informed as to the distinguishing characteristics of their writing instruction. Both teachers expressed interest in the research and voluntarily elected to be participants in the study.

Selection of Individuals. Three children were chosen from each of the two classes to supply writing process data. These six children were selected by the researcher after an examination of writing samples from all the children in both classes. The six children were chosen for study because their writing samples indicated that they represented a diversity of background experiences in writing, and therefore could provide writing process and product data from the broad spectrum of possible kindergarten writing behaviors. Selection of a limited number of individuals allowed for close observation of complex phenomena involved in the classroom writing process.

Following the selection of the three children from each of the two classrooms, one child in each classroom was selected to provide interview data. Information from interviews with other children in the classrooms was used as triangulation data (Guba & Lincoln, 1981) to add reliability to the children's perceptions described in this report.

Procedures

Throughout data collection, each teacher maintained a writing folder for each child; all types of writing from various daily activities were placed in

the folder. At one-week intervals, the researcher collected the writing folders, recorded information directly related to each of the research questions in Phase 1, and returned the folders to teachers. Teachers' instructional behaviors (Phase 2) and children's writing processes (Phase 3) were recorded through weekly personal and video-taped observations of the teachers and children during writing episodes throughout the school year. At the end of the school year, children from both classrooms were interviewed and tape recorded regarding their writing process and their teacher's instructional behaviors during writing instruction.

RESULTS

Phase 1: Large Group

This large group phase of the study was concerned with the influence of the teachers' instructional behaviors on the frequency, length, and theme choice of the children's writing efforts. Children in the natural language learning classroom wrote longer selections ($\bar{x}$ = 9.1 words) than did children in the standardized, sequential classroom ($\bar{x}$ = 4.1 words). Children also wrote more often in the natural language learning classroom ($\bar{x}$ = 9.2 products/month) than did children in the standardized, sequential classroom ($\bar{x}$ = 4.0 products/month). Theme choice of the children was influenced by the teacher's instructional behaviors, also. The choices are distributed among four theme areas in the natural language-learning classroom: self (events involving the child, which were about to take place or actually took place); themes about actual happenings involving the children's immediate family and pets; themes about actual happenings involving extended family members; and the school, community or other happenings. The choices of children in the standardized, sequential classroom are distributed between only two themes: the theme of self, and the theme of school or community or other happenings.

Phase 2: Teachers' Instructional Behaviors

Phase 2 of this study described the instructional behaviors exhibited by teachers in both the standardized, sequential classroom and in the natural language-learning classroom.

The length of time for actual writing instruction and children's writing episodes was somewhat longer in the natural language-learning classroom. A mean of 20.4 minutes was spent per writing episode in the natural language-learning classroom. By contrast, a mean of 10.8 minutes was spent per writing episode in the standardized, sequential writing classroom. Instruction in the natural language-learning classroom tended to be with individuals or small groups; direct instruction was with the entire class in the standardized, sequential classroom.

Eight instructional behaviors related to writing instruction in the prewriting phase were identified in one or both classrooms during data analysis. Table 1 outlines the percent of all teachers' behaviors during the introduction of writing in the classroom during the prewriting phase. These percents represent the ratio of a specific teacher behavior to the total number of teacher behaviors identified in the prewriting phase. Whereas the teacher in the standardized, sequential classroom most frequently focused upon instruction in letter-level analysis and word-level analysis, the teacher in the natural language-learning classroom tended to focus upon managing writing supplies and suggesting topics.

Insert Table 1 Here

Eight teacher behaviors were identified during the composing phase of the writing episode (see Table 2). The teacher in the standardized, sequential

classroom most frequently observed children composing and instructed children in grapheme analysis; the teacher in the natural language-learning classroom most frequently suggested topics and information.

Insert Table 2 Here

During the postwriting phase (see Table 3), the teacher in the standardized, sequential classroom most frequently praised or encouraged, managed supplies and writing products, and instructed in grapheme analysis at the letter-level; the teacher in the natural language-learning classroom praised the children, inquired about the story or picture, transcribed the children's products into more conventional writing, or received the product by reading the writing aloud.

Insert Table 3 Here

The teacher comments written on the writing products of the children may be classified into four categories. The comments in the standardized, sequential classroom involved comments concerning graphemes (73% of all products), spelling (5% of all products), or no comments at all (22%); the comments on the writing products in the natural language-learning classroom were generally not commented on at all (98%), or concerned a writing convention (2% of all products).

Phase 3: Children's Writing Processes

The third phase of the study documented the writing processes used by children with varying experience with writing and documented the writing processes in both the standardized, sequential classroom and the natural language-learning classroom.

Few differences were found regarding the writing behaviors of children with varying experiences with writing in either classroom (see Table 4). Highly experienced writers were more apt to listen to teacher instruction during the prewriting phase, edit for aesthetics and information in the composing phase, and read their message in the postwriting phase. Less experienced writers were more apt to consult a resource for letter formation, edit for spelling, abandon a draft, and tell their message after completing a draft. During the postwriting phase, children in the standardized, sequential classroom were not involved in instructional activities: the behaviors reported are attributable to the natural language-learning classroom.

Insert Table 4 Here

Greater differences occurred between classrooms than between writers of varying experiences with writing (see Table 5). Children in the standardized, sequential classroom were more apt to listen to teacher instruction, consult a resource for letter formation, and edit aesthetics. Children in the natural language-learning classroom were more apt to work on drawing, talk to a friend or a group, form letters or sounds with their mouth, reread aloud or silently, edit spelling, abandon drafts, explain drawing, and tell, read, explain, and extend the writing message.

Insert Table 5 Here

Phase 4: Interviews

Phase 4 examined case study data regarding the children's perceptions of the writing processes used during writing and their perceptions of the teachers' instructional behaviors during writing instruction.

Although children in both classrooms perceived the locating of materials as a part of the prewriting phase of the writing episode, on the whole the children in the different classrooms perceived the process of writing differently. Children in the standardized, sequential classroom perceived writing letters and writing words as the only composing phase behaviors; but children in the natural language-learning classroom perceived drawing, rereading the product aloud, thinking about the story, and writing the story as behaviors that occur during the composing phase. Children in the standardized, sequential classroom perceive no postwriting phase behaviors; however, children in the natural language-learning classroom perceive reading the message, sharing the story with the teacher, peers, and family, and keeping the story as behaviors of the postwriting phase.

Children of different classrooms perceived the instructional behaviors differently, also. The children in the standardized, sequential classroom perceived the teacher as managing supplies, observing the composing, praising the finished product, and correcting their letter formation. They did not see the teacher as an audience for a message in their finished product. The children in the natural language-learning classroom perceived the teacher as managing supplies, observing the composing, transcribing (word for word) the child's written story into conventionally written language, and reading their story.

DISCUSSION

Instructional Behaviors

If a single variable were to be identified as the most important influence on writing in the classrooms, it would be the instructional decisions of the teacher. The teachers' instructional behaviors played a major, influential role in every aspect of writing in these classrooms.

The standardized, sequential classroom emphasized letter-level and word-level analysis throughout writing instruction. The children in this classroom wrote fewer, shorter writing products, many of which were isolated letters, or teacher-selected words or sentences. The goal was not to allow children to convey a message, but to focus their attention on letter formation. The children in this classroom were more dependent on the teacher for instruction and direction and more dependent on resources for letter development. Little or no risk-taking was apparent in the classroom: although taking risks with print could possibly occur at the letter level ("Flexibility Principle," Clay, 1975) and word level ("Preliterate Phase," Henderson, 1985) risk-taking with different ways to express ideas and explore language was not an available option in this classroom focusing so specifically on letter and word formation.

The natural language-learning classroom rarely focused children's attention on the graphic features of print. Children wrote more and longer products than did children in the standardized, sequential classroom. They were allowed to choose their own topic, and they conveyed a message in each of their products. Children were less dependent on teacher directives and resources, and were more independent writers, willing to take risks with print, language, and their messages.

In each of the classrooms observed, children's writing processes differed as a result of transactions among the instructional behaviors of their particular teacher, their previous experiences with writing, and their willingness to take risks with language. The principal conclusion gleaned from examining instruction, experience, and risk-taking is that these factors transact differently, with teachers' instructional behaviors as the major influence, to produce five different types of writers.

Writers in the standardized, sequential classroom tended to be either graphic centered/highly experienced; or graphic centered/less experienced:

1. Graphic centered/highly experienced writers.

   These children wrote quickly, looking at the model prepared by the teacher only occasionally. The strokes used for letter formation were stabilized and more conventional. They would occasionally edit letters for convention/form.

2. Graphic centered/less experienced writers.

   Children with these characteristics wrote slowly, looking at the teacher's model quite often. The strokes used for letter formation were often not yet stable in the children's handwriting. They would often edit letters for convention/form purposes.

These writers did not perceive writing as having a postwriting phase, which was symptomatic perhaps of the assignment having no meaningful language purpose other than the formation of letters and having no real audience during or after the writing episode. These children had no writing opportunities available to them for taking risks with language.

The writers in the natural language-learning classroom were also different in terms of experience with writing. However, these children tended to be message-centered in their writing, perhaps because they were allowed, by the nature of their instruction by the teacher, to be message-centered and to be self-reliant in the production of their writing. The processes used by message-centered children, as a result of the teacher's focus in the writing episode, are all means to a final goal: the construction of a message to share. Writing processes within each phase of the writing episode, including drawing the story, talking to a friend or group about their story, reading or rereading the story, and sharing the story upon its completion, were all centered upon providing the opportunity to share the children's experiences and language. The characteristics of the children's writing may be summarized as follows:

3. Message-centered/highly experienced writers/risk-taker with language.
   Children with these characteristics orchestrated their messages in drawings and in talking with other children during both the prewriting and composing phases. These children wrote quickly, formed the letter sounds while writing, and reread their products when completed. These children would occasionally edit to make spelling and information changes. Their products would often be read aloud by the teacher during the postwriting phase.
4. Message-centered/less experienced writers/risk-taker with language.
   These children orchestrated their message in drawings and in talk with other children during the prewriting and composing phases. These children wrote quickly, although their letter formation and use of conventions were less developed than other children's. These children also formed the letters' sounds while writing, but seldom reread their products to themselves when completed. These products would often be read to the teacher by the children. These children would usually extend and explain their message.
5. Message-centered/less experienced writers/not a risk-taker with language.
   Children demonstrating these characteristics conveyed their message in the form of drawings and talk with other children. These children tended to write either nothing at all or only letters or words familiar to them, and would often consult a resource for letter formation. They did not form the sounds of the letters as they wrote, but tended to rely on memorized spellings. Products were seldom finished and not reread to themselves. However, messages were told to the teacher for her to write. These children also extended and explained their message.

Following the production of the message, that message was shared with friends, teacher, family as a result of the teacher instruction focusing on the production of purposeful writing.

Each of the above five profiles are composite descriptions of a type of writer. Of course, these characteristics could emerge in all writers under varying circumstances and are not meant to be standardized traits for classifying children.

The profiles reveal how strongly the teacher's instructional behaviors constrained the range of writing processes of the children. Children in the standardized, sequential classroom were less different in terms of their writing processes than were children in the natural language-learning classroom. The instructional goals and behaviors of the teacher in the standardized, sequential classroom seemed to limit the range of writing strategies used by the children to those which only concern the attainment and maintenance of conventionality in letter and word formation. Children in this classroom were not taking any risks with written language because the goal of the instruction may very well be to inhibit the flexibility of the letter and word formation. Achieving conventionality of letter formation and developing a vocabulary of sight words is perceived as a function of beginning language instruction so that at some later date messages may be written in a conventionally acceptable form. This approach, then, has the embedded assumption that language learning is hierarchical in nature: letter formation and sight word development must precede writing messages.

However, in the natural language-learning classroom, the range of writing strategies used was much greater in each of the writing phases since children were encouraged to take risks with the written form in order to get their messages on paper. The goal was to produce a written message. This approach

to writing instruction, then, has an alternate embedded assumption that letter formation and other conventions of writing will best develop through the orchestration of those messages over time in an atmosphere of acceptance and encouragement. The teacher in this classroom did not assume that these writers were any less prepared to express a written message simply because they have had fewer experiences with writing than older children, nor that they were less able to produce a message. This teacher also did not assume that the language written by these children was in any way less complete, in terms of its intent, than the language of any other writer.

Children's Writing Experiences

Whereas few differences existed between highly experienced and less experienced writers in the standardized, sequential classroom, children in the natural language-learning classroom showed a broader range of some kinds of behaviors. Highly experienced writers tended to read their messages, whereas less experienced writers tended to tell their message. One could speculate that some less experienced writers are merely less experienced readers as well, providing a possible link between the children's reading and writing experiences. This is not to say that all less experienced writers opted to retell rather than reread their message, however. Some less experienced writers whose products were almost completely nonconventional would read their entire text. This, again, is demonstrative of an instructional setting which allows children to take risks and experiment with their language. This risk-taking, children reading their own meaning filled yet nonconventional writing, leads this researcher to believe that those who would label such text production as prewriting are not considering the semantic intent of the writers (Milz, 1983; Harste, Woodward, & Burke, 1984), either at the point of text production or subsequent rereadings. Literacy lies in the intent, not in the approximation of the conventions of language.

REFERENCES

Beers, J. (May, 1976). High and low frequency words: How first and second graders spell them and why. Paper presented at the International Reading Association Convention, Anaheim.

Beers, J., & Henderson, E. (1977). First grade children's developing orthographic concepts. Research in the Teaching of English, 11, 133-148.

Carter, J. (1983). Characteristics of successful writing instruction: A preliminary report. Elementary School Journal, 84, 40-44.

Clay, M. M. (1975). What did I write? New Zealand: Heinemann Educational Books.

Cordeiro, P., Giacobbe, M. E., & Cazden, C. (1983). Apostrophes, quotation marks, and periods: Learning punctuation in the first grade. Language Arts, 60, 323-332.

DeFord, D. E. (1978). A validation study of an instrument to determine a teacher's theoretical orientation to reading instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

DeFord, D. E. (1981). Literacy: Reading, writing, and other essentials. Language Arts, 58, 652-658.

Dyson, A. H. (1983). The role of oral language in early writing processes. Research in the Teaching of English, 17, 1-30.

Glassner, B. M. (November, 1979). What empirical research reveals about topics and writing processes. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, San Francisco.

Graves, D. H. (1973). Children's writing: Research directions and hypotheses based upon an examination of the writing processes of seven-year-old children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Graves, D. H. (1977). Language arts textbooks: A writing process evaluation. Language Arts, 54, 817-823.

Graves, D. H. (1979). Let children show us how to help them write. Visible Language, 13, 16-28. (a)

Graves, D. H. (1979). What children show us about revision. Language Arts, 56, 312-319. (b)

Graves, D. H. (1981, August). A case study observing the development of primary children's composing, spelling, and motor behaviors during the writing process. NIE Grant No. G-78-0174 Project No. 8-34/9-0963. (a)

Graves, D. H. (1981). A new look at research on writing. In S. Haley-James (Ed.), Perspectives on writing in grades 1-8, Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 93-116. (b)

Graves, D. H. (1982). How do writers develop? Langauge Arts, 59, 173-179.

Graves, D. H. & Calkins, L. M. (1980). Research update: Children learn the writer's craft. Language Arts, 57, 207-213.

Graves, D. H. & Giacobbe, M. E. (1982). Questions for teachers who wonder if their writers change. Language Arts, 59, 495-503.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. and London: Jossey-Bass Limited.

Harrington-Brogan, V. S. (1983). Instructional writing suggestions in elementary school language arts textbooks: An analysis based upon opinions of writing authorities. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 1332A-1333A.

Harste, J. C., Burke, C. L. & Woodward, V. A. (1981, August). Children, their language and world: Initial encounters with print. NIE Grant No. G-79-0132.

Harste, J. C., Burke, C. L. & Woodward, V. A. (1983, February). The Young Child as Writer-Reader and Informant. NIE Grant No. NIE-G-0121.

Harste, J. C., Woodward, V. A., and Burke, C. L. (1984). Examining our assumptions: A transactional view of literacy and learning. Research in the Teaching of English, 18, 84-108.

Henderson, E. (1985). Teaching Spelling. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Henderson, E. (1978, May). On learning to spell. Paper presented to the Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistics Special Interest Group, International Reading Association Annual Convention, Houston.

Kamler, B. (1980). One child, one teacher, one classroom: The story of one piece of writing. Language Arts, 57, 680-693.

King, M. L. (1981, March). Contexts for Writing. Paper presented at the Ohio Department of Education Basic Skills Conference on Written Communication, Columbus.

King, M. L. & Rentel, V. (1979). Toward a theory of early writing development. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 243-253.

Kinneavy, J. (1971). A Theory of Discourse. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Lamme, L. L. & Childers, N. M. (1983). The composing processes of three young children. Research in the Teaching of English, 17, 31-50.

Milz, V. E. (1983). A Psycholinguistic Description of the Development of Writing in Selected First Grade Students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.

Moss, R. K. & Stansell, J. C. (1982, May). Comprehension on context: Social and situational influences on story retellings. Paper given at the International Reading Association, Chicago.

Moss, R. K. & Stansell, J. C. (1983). Wof stew: A recipe for writing growth and enjoyment. Language Arts, 60, 346-350.

Ney, J. W. (1974). Notes toward a psycholinguistic model of the writing process. Research in the Teaching of English, 8, 157-169.

Odell, L. (1977). Measuring changes in intellectual processes as one dimension of growth in writing. In C. R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

O'Hare, F. (1979). Interview: In praise of sentence-combining, chunks, and messiness. English Quarterly, 12, 9-19.

Page, W. (1974). The author and the reader in writing and reading. Research in the Teaching of English, 8, 170-183.

Peterson, B. T. (1980, April). Infinite combinations: Integrating composition and literature. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the College English Association, Dearborn.

Raban, B. (July, 1982). Influences on children's writing, 5-9 years. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the United Kingdom Reading Association, Newcastle upon Tyne, England. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 222 921).

Shanklin, N. K. L. (1981). Relating reading and writing: Developing a transactional theory of the writing process. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Table 1 Percent of all identified teachers' behaviors during introduction of writing in the classroom during prewriting phase

Instructional Behaviors	Teacher	
	Mrs. H St., Seq. Base	Mrs. M Nat. Lang.
1. Manages writing supplies	10	24
2. Directs artwork	0	14
3. Instructs letter-level analysis		
A. Grapheme	10	0
B. Phoneme	7	0
4. Instructs word-level analysis		
A. Spelling	24	0
B. Phonemes	10	0
5. Instructs convention	0	4
6. Suggests topic	4	20
7. Suggests information	0	4
8. Praises or encourages	4	14
9. Nonrelated behaviors	30	21

Table 2 Percent of teachers' specific instructional behaviors during composing phase

Instructional Behaviors	Teacher	
	Mrs. H	Mrs. M
1. Observes composing	29	11
2. Instructs letter-level analysis		
A. Grapheme	21	0
B. Phoneme	0	17
3. Instructs word-level analysis		
A. Spelling	4	0
B. Phonemes	4	0
4. Instructs convention	0	11
5. Suggests topic	0	24
6. Suggests information	0	17
7. Praises and encourages	11	11
8. Nonrelated behavior	31	9

Table 3 Percent of all identified teachers' behaviors during postwriting phase

Instructional Behaviors	Teacher	
	Mrs. H St., Seq. Base	Mrs. M Nat. Lang.
1. Praises or encourages	28	19
2. Instructs letter-level analysis		
A. Grapheme	22	0
B. Phoneme	2	0
3. Instructs word-level analysis		
A. Spelling	8	1
B. Phonemes	4	0
4. Instructs convention	0	6
5. Receives story		
A. As told by child	0	2
B. As read by child	0	1
C. As read by teacher	0	14

Table 3 (continued)

Instructional Behaviors	Teacher	
	Mrs. H	Mrs. M
	St., Seq. Base	Nat. Lang.
6. Composes story		
A. Translates from written	0	16
B. Extends from oral or written	0	2
C. Writes from oral	0	7
7. Inquires about picture or story	0	17
8. Manages supplies and products	28	7
9. Non-related behaviors	9	1

Table 4 Percent of writing episodes in which writing processes are used by writers with different amounts of experience

Writing Processes	Child's Writing Experiences		
	Many	Moderate	Few
Prewriting Phase			
1. Locates materials	100	100	100
2. Listens to teacher	63.7	59.1	68.2
3. Works on drawing	50	36.4	50
4. Talks to friend, group	92.9	85.7	92.9
5. Listens to teacher instruction	54.6	42.9	42.9
Composing Phase			
1. Talks to friend, group	73.6	85.7	76.6
2. Consults resource for letter formation	50	50	86.4
3. Forms letters/sounds with mouth	50	57.2	57.2

Table 4 (continued)

Writing Processes	Child's Writing Experiences		
	Many	Moderate	Few
4. Rereads aloud or silently	50	92.9	63.7
5. Edits aesthetics	91.2	47.4	50
6. Edits spelling	22.8	9.1	32.5
7. Edits information	13.7	0	0
Postwriting Phase			
1. Abandons draft	0	11.1	48.1
2. Explains drawing	43.8	44.4	13.7
3. Tells message	0	27.8	31.8
4. Reads message	50	16.7	9.1
5. Explains message	43.8	50	50
6. Extends message	31.3	50	50

Table 5 Percent of writing episodes in which writing processes occur within instructionally different classrooms

Writing Processes	Classrooms: Standardized, Sequentially Based Classroom	Classrooms: Natural Language-Learning Classroom
Prewriting Phase		
1. Locates materials	100	100
2. Listens to teacher	100	27.3
3. Works on drawing	0	91.0
4. Talks to friend, group	81.0	100
5. Listens to teacher instruction	90.5	3.3
Composing Phase		
1. Talks to friend, group	66.6	90.6
2. Consults resource for letter formation	100	24.2
3. Forms letters/sounds with mouth	9.5	100

Table 5 (continued)

Writing Processes	Classrooms: Standardized, Sequentially Based Classroom	Classrooms: Natural Language-Learning Classroom
4. Rereads aloud or silently	11.9	75.8
5. Edits aesthetics	95.2	9.1
6. Edits spelling	9.5	33.4
7. Edits information	0	9.1
Postwriting Phase		
1. Abandons draft	4.3	49.5
2. Explains drawing	0	67.9
3. Tells message	0	39.7
4. Reads message	0	50.5
5. Explains message	0	95.8
6. Extends message	0	87.5

3/H